# JS 44 (Rev. 12/12 Case 2:15-cv-12602-GCS-DRGVECTOVER FILE 12/12/3/15 Page ID.1 Page 1 of 7

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Charee Stewart 2774 Cherokee Drive, Waterford, MI 48328	Charee Stewart 2774 Cherokee Drive, Apartment 18			ration Personal Transit #1800	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Oakland County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)  Mark Small, Esq.			Attorneys (If Known)		
656 W. Frank St. Birmingham, MI 4800 (248) 376-3110					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	CITIZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
U.S. Government Plaintiff	≥ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(Far Diversity Cases Only) P Citizen of This State	FF DEF  1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In T	incipal Place 4 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	Parties in Item III)		2 Incorporated and F of Business In A	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					
CONTRACT	TOI		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act  152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans		Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
(Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits  190 Other Contract  195 Contract Product Liability  196 Franchise	□ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Liability PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage  385 Property Damage Product Liability	LABOR  Y □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Management Relations □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act □ 790 Other Labor Litigation	SOCIAL SECURITY    861 HIA (1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))   864 SSID Title XVI   865 RSI (405(g))	□ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
□ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	Other  448 Education	Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:  540 Mandamus & Other  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION  462 Naturalization Application  465 Other Immigration  Actions	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision  950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	moved from \( \subseteq 3 \) Rem	anded from ☐4 ellate Court		nsferred from    6 Multidi ther District    Litigation    Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu 47 U.S.C. § 227 Brief description of caus Unlawful automated tel	se:	ling (Do not cite jurisdictional state	utes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			DEMAND S TBD	DEMAND \$ TBD CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE /		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD		
07/23/2015		Mes -	>		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		0			
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE_	MAG. JU	DGE

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

) Case No.:
)
) CIVIL COMPLAINT ) JURY DEMAND
)
)

Plaintiff, CHAREE STEWART, (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself, by and through her undersigned attorney, alleges against the Defendant, EXETER FINANCE, (hereinafter "Defendant") as follows:

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This is an action for damages arising from Defendant's violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

#### JURSIDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 3. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C § 1391(b).

#### **PARTIES**

Plaintiff is a natural person, who at all relevant times has resided in the City of Waterford,
 Michigan, 48328.

5. Defendant is a corporation doing business in the State of Michigan, with its corporate address as 222 Las Colinas Area Personal Transit #1800, Irving, Texas 75039.

#### FACTUAL STATEMENT

- 6. Plaintiff and her husband, Douglas Stewart, were co-owners of a car being financed through Defendant.
- 7. In June 2014, Mr. Stewart filed for divorce and as part of the property settlement, Plaintiff and Mr. Stewart agreed that Mr. Stewart would receive the car being financed through Defendant, and have the sole responsibility for keeping up the payments on the car to be made to Defendant.
- 8. In late August 2014, Plaintiff started receiving calls from Defendant to collect after Mr. Stewart failed to make a timely payment on the car.
- 9. When Plaintiff would answer Defendant's phone calls, there would be a few seconds of silence before Plaintiff was connected to one of Defendant's representatives.
- 10. Plaintiff spoke with one of Defendant's representatives on August 28, 2014 after receiving numerous back to back calls during the course of that day.
- Plaintiff informed Defendant's representative of the arrangement between her and Mr.
   Stewart and provided Defendant's representative with Mr. Stewart's work number.
- 12. Plaintiff then asked not to be called any further with respect to the account and to direct all future telephone calls to Mr. Stewart.
- 13. Plaintiff continued to receive telephone calls in the ensuing months whenever Mr. Stewart would be late with a payment on the car financed through Defendant.

- 14. In October 2014, Mr. Stewart also called Defendant and informed Defendant that he was solely responsible for the monthly payments for the car and not to contact Plaintiff.
- 15. On November 13, 2014, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative "Willa" as she had been continuing to receive numerous telephone calls from Defendant.
- 16. Plaintiff informed Defendant's representative that she had finalized her divorce with Mr. Stewart and the agreement specified that only Mr. Stewart was responsible for the car payments, that only Mr. Stewart should be contacted and that Plaintiff's phone number should not continue to be called.
- 17. Defendant's representative informed Plaintiff that her telephone number would be removed.
- 18. Nonetheless, the telephone calls continued to Plaintiff, often up to 6 or 7 telephone calls per day, whenever Mr. Stewart failed to make required payments to Defendant.
- 19. Plaintiff continued to ask Defendant to cease calling her regarding the car payments on multiple occasions over the next several months, but the calls would continue whenever Mr. Stewart was not current with payments.
- 20. On May 27, 2015, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative who promised to remove her phone number from the file after Plaintiff, again, asked the calls to cease.
- 21. On May 29, 2015, Plaintiff reiterated her request to a different representative who indicated she saw Plaintiff's request to be removed and that the matter would be fixed.
- 22. However, Plaintiff received two more telephone calls from Defendant that day and would continue to receive multiple telephone calls per day from Defendant in the days thereafter.

- 23. On June 5, 2015, a cease and desist letter was sent to Defendant, via certified-mail, once again asking for the calls to stop and informing Defendant that only Mr. Stewart is responsible for making the monthly payments on the car.
- 24. Defendant received the letter sent via certified mail on June 8, 2015.
- 25. Despite receipt of the cease and desist on June 8, 2015, Defendant called Plaintiff an additional forty-five times between June 9, 2015 and June 17, 2015.
- 26. All telephone calls from Defendant were made from the phone number 800-321-9637.
- 27. The phone number 800-321-9637 belongs to Defendant.
- 28. The telephone calls were made to Plaintiff's cell phone number 313-xxx-8714.
- Defendant's telephone calls to Plaintiff were made through use of an automated telephone dialing system.

# VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. § 227

- 30. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 29 and incorporates them as if set forth at length herein.
- 31. All telephone calls to Plaintiff from Defendant were done utilizing an automated dialer.
- 32. Plaintiff revoked any consent Defendant may have had to call Plaintiff's cell phone number through issuing multiple cease and desist requests over a course of many months.
- 33. Defendant's actions constitute violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) to which there falls no exemption to their behavior.

## JURY TRIAL DEMAND

34. Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment against the Defendant, and on behalf of the Plaintiff, for the following:

- a. That an order be entered declaring the Defendant's actions, as described above, in violation of the TCPA;
- That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff against Defendant for violations of 47
   U.S.C. § 227b(1)(A)(iii);
- That the Court award treble damages to Plaintiff for each violation of the TCPA the Court deems willful;
- d. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

[THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

#### Verification

I declare that the above statements are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief.

Dated: July 23, 2015

Charles Stewart

Plaintiff

Dated: July 23, 2015:

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Small, Esq. Mark L. Small PLC Attorney for Plaintiff 656 W. Frank St.

Birmingham, MI 48009 Telephone: (248) 376-3110 Email: msmall@smallslaw.com

Of Counsel for the Firm: Law Offices of Michael Lupolover 120 Sylvan Avenue, Suite 300 Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632 Telephone: 201-461-0059

Fax: 201-608-7116

Email: matthew@lupoloverlaw.com